

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/783,660	02/14/2001	Peter M. Mansour	SPRODQ1100	9105	
25763	7590 05/23/2006		EXAMINER		
DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT			LESNIEWSKI, VICTOR D		
	IXTH STREET		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-1498			2152		

DATE MAILED: 05/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/783,660	MANSOUR ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Victor Lesniewski	2152	

		1	
	Victor Lesniewski	2152	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>03 May 2006</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notal Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, af otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply m	fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	·	to the Real orthographer and	introduction to the control of the
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejecti	on.
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	06.07(f).	126(a) and the engage	to automaion foo
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b NOTICE OF APPEAL	dension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr jinally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ice action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in com	nliance with 37 CFR 41 37 must be	filed within two mont	hs of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed	ension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	o avoid dismissal of th	ne appeal. Since
AMENDMENTS  3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief	F will not be entered b	ecalise
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,</li> <li>They raise new issues that would require further compared to the first th</li></ol>	onsideration and/or search (see NC	TE below);	coausc
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or	etter form for appeal by materially re	educing or simplifying	the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally re	jected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a))			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s	):		
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proposed. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed:  Claim(s) objected to:  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ worlded below or appended.	ill be entered and an	explanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b because applicant failed to provide a showing of good at was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	ut before or on the date of filing a N nd sufficient reasons why the affida	Notice of Appeal will <u>n</u> vit or other evidence i	ot be entered s necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessal.	overcome all rejections under appe	eal and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after	entry is below or attac	hed.
11.   The request for reconsideration has been considered b	ut does NOT place the application	in condition for allowa	nce because:
<ul> <li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)</li> <li>13. ☑ Other: See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ul>	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper	No(s).	
NY	BL	JNJOB JAROENCH ERVISOBY PATEN	IONWANIT F EXAMINER

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 7-05) Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

Continuation of 13. Other: The examiner thanks the applicant for pointing out an inconsistency in the final rejection prepared by a previous examiner and dated 1/31/2006. At paragraph 71 on page 13, the previous examiner admits that "a UI formatting module that generates said UI form definition based upon a number of device capabilities" is not disclosed by Filepp. Claims 2, 19, and 45 recite a similar limitation and thus are placed under the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Filepp in view of Kikinis. The limitations of the claims remain rejected as presented in the action dated 1/31/2006 and the rationale described in paragraph 71 should also be applied to the limitation in claims 2, 19, and 45 that is similar to the limitation discussed herein.

Thus, claims 1-70 remain rejected for the reasons presented in the final action dated 1/31/2006. The proper distribution of claims under each rejection is as follows:

Claims 1, 3-18, 38-44, 53, 55-59, 61-65, 67, 69, and 70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Filepp. Claims 2, 19-37, 45-52, 54, 60, 66, and 68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Filepp in view of Klkinis.